EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

Elialge 2:55

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: ATET MOBILITY SERVICES, LLC, a (AVISO AL DEMANDADO); Delaware Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: LUIS M. SALAS RAZO (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similary situated.

FOR COURT USE ONLY. (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)
FT ED MADERA SUPERIOR COURT
ÁÜQ:2 7 2019
ADRIENNE Y CALIP
DEPUT

NOTICE! You have been been that court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Road the information

Nou have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on the publicity of the a written response at this court and have a copy served on the publicity. A letter of phone cell will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper teget form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts. Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinio.co.gov/self/self), your county law library or the courthouse nearest you. It you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court form a walve form. If you do not file you response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property. may be taken without further warning from the court,

may be taken without further warring from the court.

There are other legal requirements, You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney, referrel services if you cannot afford an attorney; you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofil legal services program. You can locate these nonprofil groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lewhelpcelifornia.org); the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinto.ce.gov/selfhelp); or by confacting your local county ber association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lian for waived fees and costs on any sottlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a court of courts lian must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

INVISOI Lo hen demandedo: Si no responde dentro de 30 dies la corte puede decidir en su contre sin escuchar su version. Loc la información a continuación.

Continuación
Tieno 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le enfreguen esta citación y pepetes legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en este, corte y necer que se entregue una conta demandanto. Una caria o una llamada telefónica no lo protegon: Su respuesta por escrito en este, corte y necer que se entregue una conta demandanto. Una caria o una llamada telefónica no lo protegon: Su respuesta por escrito llene que ester an formator legal correcto al desea que procesan su cása en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulanto que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Pueda encontrar estos formularlos de la corte y más información en ol Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorto.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de legas de contenta de corte y más información en ol Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorto.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de legas de contenta de exención de pago de cuotas: Si no presente su respuesta a llempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podra quiter su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advartencia.

Hay ofros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame e un abogado finaediatamente. Si no conce a un ebogado, pueda llamar a un servicio do remisión a abogados. Si no puede pegar e un abogado, los posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gir finas de lucro. Pueda encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sillo web de Celifornia, Logal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de Celifornia, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o porifendose en conjecto con la corte o el cologió de abogados locales. AVISO: Por loy, la corte tilene derecho a rocalemar las cuotas y los costos exentos por limponer un gravomen estore qualquer recuperación, de \$10,000 o més de velor recibida mediante un apuerdo o una cortesión de arbitreje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte ada que procupar de contrato de corte de cor

pager el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desecher el caso:

he name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Madera County Superior Court, State of California 200 South "G" Street Madera, CA 93637 CASE NUMBER:

•			
The name, address, and teleph	one number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without ar mero de leterono del epopedo del demendante, o del d	n allornay; is: demendante due no tiene et	ກ່ວັດຄຸຢ່າງ: ສູຊົງ:
Marcus J. Bradley, Es	q,	: (805) 270-7100 F:	(805) 270-7589:
Kiley L. Grombacher, BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, I	Lib, .	ADRIÉNNE Y. CALI	į̃Ρ.
2815 Townsgate Rd., S DATE: AHR 2 7 2	uite 1.30, Westlake Village, CA 91361	TIFFANIE FEL	
(Fecha)	(Secrétario) mons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-0	010):)	(Adjunio)
(Para prueba de entrega de est	a citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summo	ns, (POS:010)):	
(SEAL)	NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served	'n.	
	2. as the person, sued under the fictillous name	e of (specify).	
Carthe Vance as _ 1	3. Don'behall, or (specify): AT&T Mo	bility service	s, LLC a
SEAL	under. CCP 416:40 (corporation)	CCP 416,60 (m	ilnor)
	CCP 416:20 (defunct corporation)		
	CCP 416.40 (association or partner other (specify):	rship): L CCP 416,90 (a	nítióuls ég beisbu)
	4. by personal delivery on (date): \$ (10.1	(, 9	
Form Adopted for Mandatons I bin (177)	CHASSONIC	Code of	Chil Provide SE'412 20 405

Judicial Council of California SUM-100 Rev. July 1; 2009)

·		#			
Commence of the second	7 . 10 Same Add - 20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	<u>CM-010</u> ,			
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (None, Shine es	number, and our usal	FOR COURT USE ONLY			
Marcus J. Bradiay, Esq.	_				
2815 Townsgate Road, Suite 130 Westlake Village, California 91361	_				
TELEPHONE NO.: 805-270-7100	FAX NO. 805-270-7589	F. H. C.L.			
ATTORNEY FOR INSIDE Plaintiff, EUIS M. S.		MADERA SUPERIOR COURT			
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF M	ADERA,	₩ → ₩			
STREET ADDRESS: 200 South "G" Street		AUG 2 7 2019			
CITY AND ZIE CODE: Madera, CA 93637.	ž.	ADDITION ON THE			
BRANCH NAME:	5m	ADRIENNE Y CALIP CLEIX			
CASE NAME:	"CONTRACTOR OF THE TRACTOR OF THE TR	DEPUTY			
	•				
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation-	CSENUTE VOSE 1925			
Unlimited Limited	Counter Joinder	場合からしてングラ			
(Amount (Amount demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defen	Judge Judge			
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3:402				
	ow must be completed (see instructions				
1. Check one box below for the case type the	t best describes this case:				
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court roles 8.400 S.403)			
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (08)	' recent ar at an ar a land			
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antibust/Trade regulation (03)			
Other PIRD/WD (Personal Injury/Property) Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09):	Construction defect (10)			
Asbestos (04)	Insurance coverage (18).	Securities (ligation (28).			
Product liability (24)	Other contract (37) Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)			
Medical malpractice (45)	'Emirient'domain/Inverse;	Incurance coverage claims arising from the			
Other PVPD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims erising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)			
Non-PI/PDM/D (Other) Tort:	Wrongful eviction (33)	and a second sec			
Business tort/unfair business prectice (07	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment			
Civil Honts (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)			
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellanoous Civil Compleint			
Fraud (16)	Residential (32):	Rico (27)			
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38) Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)			
Professional negligence (25): Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forteitiers (05):	Miscellaneous Civil Patition			
Employment)	Pention re: airbitianton award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)			
Wrongtos (emination (38))	Witt of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)			
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39),	entre en a soul sin a avers of			
2. This case is is for is not com	olex under rule 3.400 of the California R	ues of Court. If the case is complex, mark the			
factors requiring exceptional judicial mana	gement:				
a. Lerge number of separatety repre		r`of,witnesses;			
b. Extensive motion practice raising		with related ections pending in one of more courts			
'issues trat; will be time consuming to resolve. In other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal count.					
cui Substantial amount of documenta	er at	ostjudgment judicial subervision			
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.		declaratory or injunctive relief c püünitive			
4. Number of causes of action (specify): On		•			
.5. This case) [is is is not a clas					
6. If there are any known related cases, file a	nd serve a notice of related case. (You	nay use form CM-016.).			
Date: August 26, 2019	56				
Marcus J. Bradley	100				
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	NOTICE	GENATURE OF PARTY OR ATTOMIC FOR			
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the	rst paper filed in the action of proceeding	ig (except small dalms cases or cases, filed			
inder the Probate Code Family Code, or Weltere and Institutions Code): (Cal. Rules of Court rule 3:220.) Fallure to file may result					
inisanótlons. File this cover sheel iniaddition to any cover sheet required by local court rule;					
if this case is complex under rule 3 400 el seg, of the California Rules of Count you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all					
other parties to the action or proceeding:					
Unless this is a collections case under rule	3:740 or a complex case, this cover she	eet will be used for statistical purposes only			
Form Adopted for Mandatory Use.	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Cet. Rules of Court, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400-3.403 3.740.			
Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 (Rev. July 1; 2007)		Cei. Standards of Judicial Administration, sid.: 3.10.			

CM-010

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties In Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3,400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

```
Auto Tort
     Auto (22)-Personal injury/Property
          Damage/Wrongful Death
     Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the
          case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to
          arbitration, chack this item instead of Auto)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/
Property Damage/Wrongful Death)
     Asbestos (04)
          Asbestos Property Damage
Asbestos Personal Injury/
```

Wrongful Death Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24) Medical Malpractice (45) Medical Malpractice Physicians & Surgeons Other Professional Health Care Malpractice Other PI/PD/WD (23)
Premises Liability (e.g., slip

and fall) Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (e.g., assault, vandalism) Intentional Infliction of **Emotional Distress** Negligent Infliction of **Emotional Distress** Other PI/PD/WD

Non-Pi/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07) Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08) Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)Fraud (16) Intellectual Property (19) Professional Negligence (25) Legal Malpractice Other Professional Malpractice (nal medical or legal)
Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35) **Employment**

Wrongful Termination (36)

Other Employment (15)

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES Contract Breach of Contract/Warranty (06) Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence) Negligent Breach of Contract/ Warranty Other Breach of Contract/Warranty Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09) Collection Case-Seller Plaintiff Other Promissory Note/Collections Case Insurance Coverage (not provisionally complex) (18)

Other Coverage Other Contract (37) Contractual Fraud Other Contract Dispute

Auto Subrogation

Real Property
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26) Writ of Possession of Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Quiet Title Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure) Unlawful Detainer Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11) Writ of Mandate (02)
Writ-Administrative Mandamus

Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review Other Judicial Review (39)
Review of Health Officer Order Notice of Appeal-Labor Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3,400-3,403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03) Construction Defect (10) Claims Involving Mass Tort (40) Securities Litigation (28) Environmental/Toxic Tort (30) Insurance Coverage Claims

(arising from provisionally complex case type listed above) (41) Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20) Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)

Confession of Judgment (nondomeştic relations) Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint RICO (27)

Other Complaint (not specified above) (42) Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (nonharassment)

> Mechanics Lien Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition Partnership and Corporate

Governance (21) Other Petition (not specified above) (43) Civil Harassment Workplace Vlotence

Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse **Election Contest** Petition for Name Change Petition for Relief From Late

Claim Other Civil Petition

		*				
1 2 3 4 5 5 6 7 8 S	BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP Marcus J. Bradley, Esq. (SBN 174156) Kiley L. Grombacher, Esq. (SBN 245960) 2815 Townsgate Road, Suite 130 Westlake Village, California 91361 Telephone: (805) 270-7100 Facsimile: (805) 270-7589 E-Mail: mbradley@bradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher@bradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher@bradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher.gbradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher.gbradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher.gbradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher.gbradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher.gbradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher.gbradleygrombacher.com kgrombacher.gbradleygrombacher.com	com				
u,	Tarzana, California 91356 Telephone: (818) 609-0807					
9	Facsimile: (818) 609-0892					
10	H-Mail: sahaqii@aql.com					
IV	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	٠				
11.	Annual Carpital Carpi	,				
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Cla	ass (
• -						
13	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
14	COUNTY OF MADERA					
		·)				
15	Trubac der tän iho	CASENO. MONDO 4 0 0F				
16	LUIS M. SALAS RAZO, on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly	[CASE.NO. MCV081925				
Ì	situated,	COMPLAINT FOR:				
17	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1. Civil Penalties for Violation of California				
18	Plaintiffs,	Labor Code §§ 2698, et. seq. ("PAGA")				
9	y.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL				
20	AT&T MOBILITY SERVICES, LLC, a					
1	Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1					
	through 100, inclusive,					
2	Defendants.					
3		·				
4						
Ш	·					
5						
6						
7						
- 11						
8	•	,				
	PAGA"	-1- COMPLAINT				
H		**** *				

FILED BY FAX

Plaintiff, Anthony Luis M. Salas Razo (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), hereby submits his Complaint against AT&T Mobility Services, LLC, a Delaware Corporation; and Does 1-100 (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants") on behalf of himself and the class of all other similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This is an enforcement action under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California *Labor Code* §2698 et seq. ("PAGA") to recover civil penalties and any other available relief on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and former and current non-exempt employees of Defendant AT&T MOBILITY SERVICES, LLC, doing business and employing individuals in California.
- 2. The Relevant Time Period is one year prior to the date this lawsuit is filed through the date judgment is rendered herein ("Relevant Time Period").
- 3. Plaintiff seeks relief on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees as a result of employment policies, practices and procedures more specifically described below, which violate the California Labor Code, and the orders and standards promulgated by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Industrial Welfare Commission, and Division of Labor Standards, and which have resulted in the failure of Defendant to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees all wages due to them. Said employment policies, practices and procedures are generally described as follows:
- a. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees all appropriate wages;
- b. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees all final wages in a timely fashion (California Labor Code §§ 201-203);
- c. Defendant failed to maintain accurate, complete, and readily available records in violation of California Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC Wage Order; and
- d. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees with proper wage statements (California Labor Code §226(a)).

- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, Defendant has engaged in, among other things, a system of willful violations of the California *Labor Code* and applicable IWC wage orders by creating and maintaining policies, practices and customs that knowingly deny employees the above stated rights and benefits.
- 5. The policies, practices and customs of Defendant described above and below has resulted in unjust enrichment of Defendant and an unfair business advantage over businesses that routinely adhere to the structures of the California Labor Code.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the provisions of the California Labor Code. On information and belief, Defendant is either a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. There is no basis for federal diversity jurisdiction in this action given that the State of California, as the real party in interest in this action, is not a "citizen" for purposes of satisfying diversity jurisdiction. Urbino v. Orkin Servs. of Cal., 726 F.3d 1118, 1123 (9th Cir. Cal. 2013). Urbino also holds that civil penalties cannot be aggregated to satisfy the amount in controversy requirement for federal diversity jurisdiction in this action, and that diversity jurisdiction cannot be established when Plaintiff's share of the civil penalties attributable to violations personally suffered are less than \$75,000. Id. at 1122.
- Venue is proper because the Defendant does business in California and in Madera County and the actions that gave rise to this action occurred in Madera County.

PARTIES

- 8. Plaintiff is a resident of Madera County, California. He is a former hourly employee of Defendant who ceased employment over 30 days ago.
- 9. Plaintiff was a victim of the policies, practices and customs of Defendant complained of in this action in ways that have deprived him of the rights guaranteed to him by California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 212, 226a, 256, 510, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,

1199,§§2698, et seq ("PAGA"), and §2699. .

AT&T Mobility Services, LLC is a Delaware Corporation doing business in the State of California. Defendant's corporate address is: 675 West Peachtree St NW, Ste 2756 ST NW,

Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant

Atlanta, GA 30308.

б

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned Defendant and DOES 1 through 100, are and were corporations, business entities, individuals, and partnerships, licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California.

12. As such and based upon information and belief Defendants do business in California, Defendants are subject to California *Labor Code* §§ 201-203, 212, 226a, 256, 510, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1199, and 2699 and 2698 et seq.

- 13. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff prays for leave to amend this complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of said fictitious Defendants were responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and members of the general public and class to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.
- 14. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants and employees of each of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment.
- 15. The other aggrieved employees are likewise current and former non-exempt employees of AT&T, employed by Defendant within the State of California during the Relevant Time Period.

2

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

3

4

5 6

7

9

8

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein. 16.

- Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were and are classified by Defendant as non-exempt employees, pursuant to the provisions of the California Labor Code, and the orders and standards promulgated by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Industrial Welfare Commission, and Division of Labor Standards. As non-exempt employees, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees are entitled to certain benefits, including mandated meal and rest breaks. In addition, said statutory provisions, wage orders, regulations and standards obligate the employer to maintain accurate records of the hours worked by employees.
- Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were not provided with proper 18. paychecks nor provided final wages in a timely manner.
- 19. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees seek unpaid wages, penalties and other compensation from Defendant for the relevant time period because Defendant inter alia improperly:
 - a. Failed to pay all wages due at appropriate rates;
 - b. Failed to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees all wages owed at termination;
 - c. Failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees with proper paychecks pursuant to Labor Code § 226; and
 - d. Failed to provide paychecks payable upon demand.
- Plaintiff alleges that the following violations occurred on a routine basis to him 20. and all other aggrieved employees during their employment with Defendants:
 - a. Unpaid Wages: Plaintiff alleges that on a routine basis he and all other aggrieved employees received paychecks without proper wages as meal period premiums, the regular rate of pay, and overtime rate were miscalculated, in violation of the Labor Code.

- b. Wage Statement Violations: Plaintiff alleges that on a routine basis he and all other aggrieved employees received wage statements in violation of Labor Code §226, as premium pay for meal period violations were paid at improper rates, and hours and rates were not properly shown on wage statements.
- c. Delayed Access to Wages: Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were required to incur delays to access their wages, in violation of Labor Code § 212.
- d. Termination/Final Wages: Defendants' failure to pay for all wages due prior to termination constitutes violation of California Labor Code §§ 201-203.

Delayed Access to Wages

- 21. Section 212 of the California *Labor Code* prohibits the payment of wages pursuant to a check "unless it is negotiable and payable in cash, on demand, without discount, at some established place of business in the state, the name and address of which must appear on the instrument."
- 22. In violation of this statute, Defendant has issued Plaintiff and other employees checks drawn on an out of state payroll account, that does not include the address of a business in California at which the checks can be cashed, on demand, without discount.

Defendant's Failure to Pay All Wages Due at Termination of Employment

- 23. At all times, relevant hereto, California Labor Code § 201 required an employer that discharges an employee to pay compensation due and owing to said employee immediately upon discharge. California Labor Code § 202 requires an employer to pay an employee who quits any compensation due and owing to said employee within seventy-two (72) hours of an employee's resignation. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required under §§ 201 and 202, then the employer is liable for waiting time penalties in the form of continued compensation for up to thirty (30) work days. Defendant's failure to pay for all wages earned prior to termination constitutes additional violations of California Labor Code §§ 201-203.
- 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all relevant times, Defendant knew or should have known, that all other employees, including Plaintiff,

were entitled to receive all wages at appropriate rates, all overtime at appropriate rates, and all commissions due at the time their employment ceased.

25. Defendant willfully and knowingly failed to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees, upon termination of employment, all accrued compensation.

Facts Regarding Willfulness

- 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant is and was advised by skilled lawyers, other professionals, employees with human resources background and advisors with knowledge of the requirements of California wage and hour laws.
- 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all relevant times, Defendant had a consistent policy or practice of failing to compensate Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees at appropriate rates and that it knew or should have known these legally appropriate rates.

PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS

- 28. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 29. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees. The aggrieved employees are composed of, and defined as follows:

Aggrieved Employees:

All employees who were or are employed by Defendant in California as "non-exempt employees" against whom one or more violations of any provision in Division 2 Part 2 Chapter 1 of the Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order were committed, as set forth in this complaint, at any time between one year prior to the filing of this complaint until judgment. As used in this definition, the term "non-exempt employee" refers to those whom Defendant has classified as non-exempt from the overtime wage provisions of the California Labor Code.

30. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved

- 31. By letter dated May 29, 2019 required notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
- 32. The LWDA has failed to respond to such notice, and more than sixty-five (65) days have passed since May 29, 2019, the date the notice was mailed to Defendant and the LWDA.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2698, et seq. (PAGA)

(Against Defendant on behalf of Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees)

- 33. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs as though fully set for herein.
- 34. PAGA permits Plaintiff to recover civil penalties for the violation(s) of the Labor Code sections enumerated in California Labor Code § 2699.5.
- 35. Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the California Labor Code including, but not limited to, the following:
- a. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees all final wages in a timely fashion (California Labor Code §§ 201-203);
- b. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees with proper wage statements (California Labor Code § 226); and
- c. Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of work performed by Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees (California Labor Code § 1174).
- 36. California Labor Code § 1198 makes it illegal to employ an employee under conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable wage order. California Labor Code §1198 requires that "... the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the ... standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful."
- 37. California Labor Code § 226(a) sets forth reporting requirements for employers when they pay wages, as follows:

"Every employer shall... at the time of each payment of wages, furnish his or her employees... an itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee ... (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis.... (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer."

Section (e) provides:

"An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) shall be entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4000), and shall be entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees."

- 38. California Labor Code § 1174 provides that "[e]very person employing labor in this state shall ... [k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors" and "[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments..."
- 39. California Labor Code §204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code § 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no

later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

3

During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees all wages due to them including, but not limited to, overtime wages, all

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

. 20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

wages due, and meal and rest period premium wages, within any time period specified by California Labor Code §204. 41. California Labor Code § 558(a) provides "[a]ny employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in

addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation,

one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3)

Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee." Labor Code

§ 558(c) provides "[t]he civil penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other

civil or criminal penalty provided by law."

Defendant, at all times relevant to this complaint, was an employer or person 42. acting on behalf of an employer(s) who violated Plaintiff and other he aggrieved employees' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code as set forth above.

43. As set forth above, Defendant has violated numerous provisions of both the Labor Code sections regulating hours and days of work as well as the applicable order of the IWC. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks the remedies set forth in California Labor Code § 558 for himself, the State of California, and all other aggrieved employees.

Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular California Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3, 2699.5 and 558. Plaintiff, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of civil penalties for Plaintiff, all other aggrieved employees, and the State of California against Defendant, in addition to other remedies, for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226, 1174, and 1198.

- 45. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California Labor Code §2699.3 and SB 836. By letter dated May 29, 2019 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the other aggrieved employees, pursuant to California Labor Code §2699.3 and SB 836, gave written notice by electronic submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and certified mail to Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
- More than 60 days have passed since the May 29, 2019 notice to the LWDA 46. and no response has been received.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, and on behalf of the other aggreeved employees, prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- For penalties as permitted by the California Labor Code, and the regulations, 1. standards and applicable wage orders promulgated thereunder, specifically including, but not limited to, for penalties permitted by California Labor Code §§ 2698-2699;
 - For interest as permitted by statute, including Labor Code § 218.6; 2.
- 3. For costs of suit and expenses incurred herein as permitted by statute, including California Labor Code §§ 226(a);
- 4. For attorneys' fees as permitted by statute, including California Labor Code §§ 226(a); and
 - For all such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper. 5.

DATED: August 24, 2019

BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP LAW OFFICES OF SAHAG MAJARIAN II

> By: Marcus J. Bradley Esc Kiley L. Grombacher

Lirit A. King, Esq. Sahag Majarian, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiffs

28

JURY DEMAND Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable as a matter of right. DATED: August 26 2019 BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP LAW OFFICES OF SAHAG MAJARIAN II By: Kiley L. Grombacher, Esq. Lirit A. King, Esq. Sahag Majarian, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiffs · 24 -12-PAGA COMPLAINT